

C



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

6

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/221,656 12/23/98 YAMAMOTO

T

EXAMINER

TM02/1023

JOSEPH R. KEATING, ESQ.
KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
10400 EATON PLACE, SUITE 312
FAIRFAX VA 22030

POINVILLE	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2164
DATE MAILED:

10/23/01

20

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

AM

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/221,656

Applicant(s)
YAMAMOTO et al.

Examiner
Frantzy Poinvil

Group Art Unit
2164

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Frantzy Poinvil

(3) _____

(2) Joseph Keating

(4) _____

Date of Interview Oct 15, 2001

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☒ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ Applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 8-73

Identification of prior art discussed:

Rembert and Kawashima

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant's representative has clearly explained the invention and argued that the combination of Kawashima and Rembert fails to teach or suggest a method of manufacturing goods based on sales data collected from a number of retail outlets or stores as recited in the independent claims. The Examiner disagrees and states that many retail stores collect sales data from their individual units and then transmit the required data to manufacture to a manufacturing plant which subsequently deliver the manufactured goods to the chain stores. Examiner suggests that applicant files a declaration showing commercial support in support to their argument.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Frantzy Poinvil
FRANTZY POINVIL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2164